

# REMARKS

Claims 1, 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Jenkins. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites "said processor determining a language of the control commands and retrieving a control program from said memory corresponding to said language." In Jenkins, the network controller 12 does not determine the language of the control command from the host 16. The host 16 communicates with the network controller 12 in a single protocol which the controller 12 then converts into the appropriate component protocol. As stated in column 8, lines 56-63, the network controller receives commands from the host in a generic protocol and then converts the command to the appropriate component protocol. Thus, the network controller 12 does not determine the language of the control commands because the language is predefined, i.e., a generic internal protocol. The generic command is then converted to a component command based on information about components in the network.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Jenkins. Claims 9 and 11 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Jenkins for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Claims 2-8, 13-17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jenkins. These claims all include the feature of "determining a language of the control commands." As described above with reference to claim 1, Jenkins does not teach or suggest this feature. In Jenkins, the host issues commands in a generic internal protocol. There is no need to determine the language of the control command because it is defined *a priori*. Jenkins teaches against the host issuing commands in multiple languages. As stated in column 3, lines 21-35, Jenkins teaches against the host issuing commands in multiple protocols. This section reads as follows.

First, control over the vacuum network is essentially protocol independent, significantly reducing the difficulty of coordinating use of components that operate under different communication protocols. Protocol independence affords the engineer of the system with greater latitude in selecting components because the protocol by which a component communicates need not be a limiting factor, thus saving costs and

DP-304678  
DEP-0216

increasing functionality within the system. Further, the increased capabilities of the vacuum network controller allow a variety of components to be connected thereto and integrated into the system without having to change the software of a tool host, which is generally very burdensome.

Jankins clearly teaches against the host 16 issuing control commands in multiple protocols and thus the network controller 12 would not need to determine the language of the control command. Accordingly, claims 2-8, 13-17 and 19 are patentable over Jankins.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

David A. Fox  
Registration No. 38,807  
55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 23413

Date: December 11, 2003

DP-304678  
DEP-0216

7